



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/735,025	12/11/2000	Kathryn L. Mitchell	10002627-1	5493

7590 12/18/2003
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PILLAI, NAMITHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/735,025

Applicant(s)

MITCHELL ET AL.

Examiner

Namitha Pillai

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-27, 29-32 and 34-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-27, 29-32 and 34-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U. S. 2001/0052910 A1 (Parekh et al.).

Referring to claims 1 and 8, Parekh discloses a system for generating GUI's through the use of a computer system (page 1, paragraph 13, lines 1-3). With this description of a delivery system involving software applications and a network of computers, it is inherent that there are computer systems involved in carrying out this GUI generator wherein, this computer system must have a processor circuit with a processor and memory to carry out the methods disclosed for generating the GUI's. As is also inherent with computer systems, it is this memory where instructions for carrying out the methods for the GUI generator are stored and wherein the processor to carry out the methods of this invention executes these instructions. Parekh discloses logic to generate an input field in the graphical user interface; the input field being associated with an input item is a template. The template as seen by the figures express contents of a digital document, the document represented as HTML documents in a markup language file again represented in HTML language (Figure 1 and page 1, paragraph 6). Parekh also discloses automatically labeling an input field label in the graphical user interface from an input field tag in the template, the input field tag being associated with the input item in the template, wherein

Art Unit: 2173

the steps of using templates to label the documents is clearly done through an automated process (page 1, paragraph 14, lines 8-20). Parekh clearly discusses having logic to generate input fields and labels for these input fields (page 1, paragraph 4, lines 6-8). Parekh then goes further to display the logic with the content from input field tags in templates clearly showing the input fields and the text that will be displayed along with these input fields provided as a label (Figure 1).

Referring to claims 2, 9 and 16, Parekh discloses that the means for identifying the input item in the template (page 3, paragraph 43, 2-5 and page 5, paragraph 69, lines 6-9).

Referring to claims 3, 10 and 17, Parekh discloses having the means to include logic in the template file, which would thereby be ignored and hence would not be included in the graphical user interface. This "rule" as stated by Parekh can be applied to any of the elements that are included in the graphical user interface and the logic code, thereby including any input items that may be in the template. See page 7, paragraph 102, and lines 1-3.

Referring to claims 4, 11 and 18, Parekh discloses having section tag and an ending section tag, wherein a number of input items are nested within the section and ending section tag in the template (page 7, paragraph 109, lines 5-7).

Referring to claims 5, 12 and 19, Parekh discloses a section label and means for generating them in the graphical user interface from the section tag in the template and wherein these sections labels are associated with an input field in the graphical user interface. These labels serve as options for the user to choose from within the input field box. See page 7, paragraph 109, lines 5-7.

Art Unit: 2173

Referring to claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21, Parekh has already disclosed an "Ignore" rule, which can be combined with any of the tags, including the section tags (page 7, paragraph 102). This rule allows for certain sections to be ignored and hence it would inherent that with this rule and the section tags, there would be certain tags that can be processed and certain ones that will be "ignored", thereby disclosing the idea of alternate section tags for both the input fields and the labels. Parekh also clearly states that this "Ignore" rule where applied will apply to all the elements that are within a set of tags, thereby teaching the idea of an alternate set of tags. See page 7, paragraph 102 and paragraph 109.

Referring to claim 15, Parekh does disclose that this invention does involve a network delivery system providing files to a network of computers, this network suggesting a server, wherein these files holding the logic for generating the GUI is stored in (page 1, paragraph 13, lines 1-3). Parekh discloses logic to generate an input field in the graphical user interface; the input field being associated with an input item is a template. The template as seen by the figures express contents of a digital document, the document represented as HTML documents in a markup language file again represented in HTML language (Figure 1 and page 1, paragraph 6). Parekh also discloses automatically labeling an input field label in the graphical user interface from an input field tag in the template, the input field tag being associated with the input item in the template, wherein the steps of using templates to label the documents is clearly done through an automated process (page 1, paragraph 14, lines 8-20). Parekh clearly discusses having logic to generate input fields and labels for these input fields (page 1, paragraph 4, lines 6-8). Parekh then goes further to display the logic with the content from input field tags in templates clearly

Art Unit: 2173

showing the input fields and the text that will be displayed along with these input fields provided as a label (Figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 22, 24-27, 29-32 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Parekh.

Referring to claim 22, Parekh discloses a system for generating GUI's through the use of a computer system (page 1, paragraph 13, lines 1-3). With this description of a delivery system involving software applications and a network of computers, it is inherent that there are computer systems involved in carrying out this GUI generator wherein, this computer system must have a processor circuit with a processor and memory to carry out the methods disclosed for generating the GUI's. As is also inherent with computer systems, it is this memory where instructions for carrying out the methods for the GUI generator are stored and wherein the processor to carry out the methods of this invention executes these instructions. Parekh discloses that these template files containing the logic to generate the graphical user interface includes properties that are default, wherein these properties apply to all aspects of the graphical user interface including the input item (page 1, paragraph 15, lines 1-2), within the document which is in a markup language file as shown in Figure 1. These template files are represented as HTML

Art Unit: 2173

documents as seen by Figure 1. Parekh discloses logic to generate an input field in the graphical user interface, as the document would appear when printed, wherein the printed information is displayed on a screen represented as the document; the input field being associated with an input item is a template, wherein the screen elements represented the appearance of the documents which are printed and displayed on the screen (page 2, paragraph 19, lines 1-10). Parekh also discloses an input field label in the graphical user interface from an input field tag in the template, the input field tag being associated with the input item in the template. Parekh clearly discusses having logic to generate input fields and labels for these input fields, with the input field included in the document as seen in Figure 1 (page 1, paragraph 4, lines 6-8). Parekh then goes further to display the logic with the input field tags in templates clearly showing the input fields and the text that will be displayed along with these input fields provided as a label (Figure 1). Parekh discloses that default values are included for all properties of the graphical user interface (page 1, paragraph 15, lines 1-2). But Parekh may not explicitly state that the default properties will be displayed with the input items in the input field in the document in the graphical user interface. But Parekh does implicitly disclose that default property values are set and that input items in the input field will be displayed, wherein these input items that are default would also then be displayed. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to include that the default value will be initially displayed in the input item. When Parekh states that there are default values for all properties and go on to teach a method for means for displaying input items to a display, it would obvious that the default value for an input item would exist and would hence be displayed.

Referring to claims 24, 29 and 34, Parekh discloses information for the position of the logic input field within the document (page 3, paragraph 44, lines 6-8). Parekh does not disclose the location coordinates. Parekh may not explicitly state that location coordinates are used to set the location of the elements of a graphical user interface. But Parekh does implicitly state that location information within a display is used, wherein when concerning graphical user interface and windows of a computer display screen, it is obvious that these areas are described in terms of location coordinates. Hence, it is obvious that pixel locations of a graphical user interface are described using location coordinates and hence, Parekh's placeholders for the screen elements will be based on location coordinates.

Referring to claims 25, 30 and 35, Parekh discloses a means for receiving an input item value and replacing the default value of the input item with it (page 6, paragraph 100).

Referring to claims 26 and 31, Parekh discloses having the means to include logic in the template file, which would thereby be ignored and hence would not be included in the graphical user interface. This "rule" as stated by Parekh can be applied to any of the elements that are included in the graphical user interface and the logic code, thereby including any input items that may be in the template. See page 7, paragraph 102, and lines 1-3.

Referring to claim 27, Parekh discloses that these template files containing the logic to generate the graphical user interface includes properties that are default, wherein these properties apply to all aspects of the graphical user interface including the input item (page 1, paragraph 15, lines 1-2). These template files are represented as HTML documents as seen by Figure 1. Parekh discloses logic to generate an input field in the graphical user interface; the input field being associated with an input item is a template, wherein the template as seen in Figure 1,

Art Unit: 2173

expressed as a markup language file. Parekh also discloses an input field label in the graphical user interface, as the document would appear when printed, wherein the printed information is displayed on a screen represented as the document, from an input field tag in the template, the input field tag being associated with the input item in the template, wherein the screen elements represented the appearance of the documents which are printed and displayed on the screen (page 2, paragraph 19, lines 1-10). Parekh clearly discusses having logic to generate input fields and labels for these input fields within the document (page 1, paragraph 4, lines 6-8). Parekh then goes further to display the logic with the input field tags in templates clearly showing the input fields and the text that will be displayed along with these input fields provided as a label (Figure 1). Parekh discloses that default values are included for all properties of the graphical user interface (page 1, paragraph 15, lines 1-2). But Parekh may not explicitly state that the default properties will be displayed with the input items in the input field in the document in the graphical user interface. But Parekh does implicitly disclose that default property values are set and that input items in the input field will be displayed, wherein these input items that are default would also then be displayed. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to include that the default value will be initially displayed in the input item. When Parekh states that there are default values for all properties and go on to teach a method for means for displaying input items to a display, it would obvious that the default value for an input item would exist and would hence be displayed.

Referring to claim 32, Parekh does disclose that this invention does involve a network delivery system providing files to a network of computers, this network suggesting a server, wherein these files holding the logic for generating the GUI is stored in (page 1, paragraph 13,

Art Unit: 2173

lines 1-3). Parekh discloses that these template files containing the logic to generate the graphical user interface includes properties that are default, wherein these properties apply to all aspects of the graphical user interface including the input item (page 1, paragraph 15, lines 1-2). These template files are represented as HTML documents as seen by Figure 1. Parekh discloses logic to generate an input field in the graphical user interface, as the document would appear when printed, wherein the printed information is displayed on a screen represented as the document, the input field being associated with an input item is a template, wherein the template as seen in Figure 1, expressed as a markup language file. Parekh also discloses an input field label in the graphical user interface from an input field tag in the template, the input field tag being associated with the input item in the template. Parekh clearly discusses having logic to generate input fields and labels for these input fields (page 1, paragraph 4, lines 6-8). Parekh then goes further to display the logic with the input field tags in templates clearly showing the input fields and the text that will be displayed along with these input fields provided as a label (Figure 1). Parekh discloses that default values are included for all properties of the graphical user interface (page 1, paragraph 15, lines 1-2). But Parekh may not explicitly state that the default properties will be displayed with the input items in the input field in the document in the graphical user interface. But Parekh does implicitly disclose that default property values are set and that input items in the input field will be displayed, wherein these input items that are default would also then be displayed. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention to include that the default value will be initially displayed in the input item. When Parekh states that there are default values for all properties and go on to teach a method

Art Unit: 2173

for means for displaying input items to a display, it would obvious that the default value for an input item would exist and would hence be displayed.

Referring to claim 36, Parekh has already disclosed an "Ignore" rule, which can be combined with any of the tags, including the section tags (page 7, paragraph 102). This rule allows for certain sections to be ignored and hence it would inherent that with this rule and the section tags, there would be certain tags that can be processed and certain ones that will be "ignored", thereby disclosing the idea of alternate section tags for both the input fields and the labels. Parekh also clearly states that this "Ignore" rule where applied will apply to all the elements that are within a set of tags, thereby teaching the idea of an alternate set of tags. See page 7, paragraph 102 and paragraph 109.

Response to Claim Changes

3. The Examiner acknowledges the Applicant's amendments to all independent claims to better specify the claimed invention in addition to the amendments to claims 22, 27 and 32, wherein limitations from dependent claims have been added to these independent claims, whereupon the respective dependent claims have been cancelled. However, all claims have been rejected as been previously disclosed or as being obvious over a previously disclosed prior art, Parekh.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9/26/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that Parekh does not show or suggest the user of the content of tags in a template file to label an input field. Parekh clearly displays in Figure 1,

Art Unit: 2173

which represents the template file, these files containing tags with the content needed to label an input field, wherein one example is the "INPUT ID" tag displayed under the canonical template file.

With respect to Applicant's arguments that Parekh does not teach or suggest display the document with input fields. As seen in the template files, which represent what is to be displayed in the document, there are clearly "INPUT ID" tags, which represent input fields, which are to be represented as the screen elements that are created.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (703) 305-7691. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Namitha Pillai
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2173
December 1, 2003



JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100